

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for her characteristically fine job of guiding the minority members of the committee in the preparation of this bill. Her constructive leadership did much to enable the committee to produce some important changes in our foreign aid program.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] for his reference to the work of 25 Republican Members of the House in making recommendations on the foreign aid bill this year. I particularly want to call the attention of the House to the importance of title IX of the bill, a new provision on the "Utilization of Democratic Institutions in Development." The new title was proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], and gives the Agency for International Development the opportunity—indeed it challenges the Agency—to take an entirely new approach toward the business of development. The proposal reflects the recommendations of the Republican paper of March 15.

It clearly implies a mandate to AID to take advantage of the importance of developing a human infra-structure as distinguished from the almost exclusively economic emphasis of previous programs.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee noted in its report that it plans to keep "close check on the manner in which the intent of this new title IX is going to be carried out."

I also would like to call the attention of the House to the inclusion in H.R. 15750 of a number of the other recommendations contained in the Republican paper. The paper urged that the recommendations of the Watson Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid be given careful attention. The committee was informed of a number of instances in which AID is moving in this direction. In addition, the committee adopted an amendment recommended by the Watson committee that will extend the maximum term of guaranties of equity investment from 20 to 30 years.

Still another Republican recommendation incorporated a suggestion of the National Citizens' Commission to the White House Conference on International Cooperation that a Private Investment Development Board be established. Section 301(a)(3) of the bill before us provides for the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council which will make recommendations to the administrator of the foreign aid program on areas and projects where private enterprise can make a positive contribution.

Similarly, the Republican paper stressed the need for a particular emphasis on development in Latin America. We are heartened to learn from the testimony of Administrator Bell that three of the eight countries for which development loans are planned are in Latin America—Brazil, Chile, and Colombia.

A significant portion of the paper was devoted to proposals for greater engagement of the people in the process of their own development. This is the theory behind the new title IX and I am pleased to note language in the committee report that encourages AID to make use of a variety of indigenous organizations "which provide the training ground for leadership and democratic processes."

We also called for AID support to private foundations here in the United States which are doing their best to facilitate competence in government and broaden the base of popular participation. One of those, which we specifically mentioned, is the International Development Foundation of New York. I hope that the language in the committee report indicating "increased reliance upon nongovernmental organizations with a demonstrated competence to enlist popular participation in the development process" will be taken very seriously by AID.

Consistent with the idea of broadening the base of popular participation in development in the emerging nations is the concept of enlarging the role for the private groups here in our own country. Sometimes, we forget the great number, variety and dedication of the groups working in the development field. The House Foreign Affairs Committee called attention to this last year with the publication of a catalog listing the overseas programs of U.S. nonprofit private organizations. We have not, however, had sufficient coordination of these private efforts in the Agency for International Development. The establishment of a coordinating mechanism was one of the points stressed in the Republican paper. I am happy to note in section 301(a)(1) of the bill before us a direction that there be established "an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this act, and in the coordination of such programs with ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental U.S. institutions."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that while these constructive recommendations were proposed by 25 Republican House Members, they received significant bipartisan support. I have already mentioned Mr. FRASER's contribution. He has long recognized the need for a new approach to foreign aid. He delivered an excellent paper on this subject at a private meeting a few months ago and I include the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

**POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: THE MISSING DIMENSION OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD DEVELOPING NATIONS**

(By Congressman DONALD M. FRASER)

Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, and friends, it is my deep conviction that political development is, indeed, the missing dimension in American policy toward the developing nations. By political development I mean the fostering, stimulation, and guidance of fundamental social structures and behaviors that make effective self-government possible.

The U.S. Government for too long has been content to deal only formally with other nations, pushing and prodding through diplomatic channels, using the leverage which our aid gives us to influence decisions, and occasionally stimulating a coup.

We have inadequate communication with the various groups and forces in developing societies and are able to exert little influence upon the shape of new forces. This deficiency becomes acute when a nation comes under insurgency attack. We step up our assistance and our military involvement, but we lack competence to deal with the political aspects of insurgency war.

We proclaim as basic public policy our intention to get new nations to stand on their own feet as stable and responsible members of the international community. Yet it seems to me that we usually treat those nations as though they already have the capacity to run their own affairs. If we only give them a substantial addition to their material resources.

I hesitate to use an anthropomorphic analogy because I fear that just such an unstated assumption may underlie some of our present neglect of political development effort.

A child, matures to adulthood, at least physically, pretty much without human intervention, given a reasonable diet and protection against the harshest threats to his life. We don't really teach a child to stand or walk—we merely encourage him to follow our example when he is physiologically ready. Without our intervention doubtless he would stand and walk and run as soon and as well on his own as with our coaching.

Our present international policies have largely relied on economic and military aid—analogs to the food and security needed by a child. I suspect that we have assumed these measures would allow the recipient young nations to mature politically by some automatic inner-directed process toward stable, responsible nationhood.

But we know far too little about political development of societies to rest our hopes on such an assumption of automatic political maturation. I for one am convinced that we must take a far more deliberate and more comprehensive role toward developing nations. We should systematically try to trigger, to stimulate, and to guide the growth of fundamental social structures and behaviors among large numbers of people in other countries if we are to insure political development commensurate with the technological and defensive military prowess we are already striving for.

To return to the human analogy I warned against earlier, sophisticated parents know that the emotional and social maturation of their children requires far more conscious effort on their part than their physical development does. Surely we can alert ourselves to the need for encouraging political growth if we hope them to become well-rounded nations.

Although U.S. interest in political development includes a wide range of considerations, including a better understanding of the effect of what we are already doing, tonight I am taking a narrower, more specific approach. I shall stress the importance of working with people and ideas and attempting to exert influence from the bottom up instead of from the top down. It is our failure to become involved with the various elements in a developing society which is the focus of my concern.

Before I discuss the policies we should adopt in the political field, I need to anticipate several objections:

Some might ask whether I am proposing to transfer the sophisticated concepts of American political democracy to the developing nations. This is not what I am proposing.

Political development doesn't mean a wholesale transfer of American values to other cultures, nor does it prescribe a competitive, two party system for societies which are barely holding together. I am proposing that the U.S. become involved with the people

ple of the developing nations as they shape their own future. This future is bound up in political values and political action.

Some will object that I am proposing to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations. It is true that nations are sensitive to interference, and when you reach in to touch their politics you may hit a sensitive nerve.

Of course we need to be circumspect and avoid interfering directly in political decision-making.

But there are many ways to become involved in the political development of another nation. We are already working overseas with the consent of governments in areas related to political development:

The campesino leadership training program—run by the Farmers Union and funded by AID

Credit union and cooperative development—run by various cooperative organizations and funded by AID

Training of trade union leadership—through the AFLD with joint labor-management support and AID funds

Community development projects under AID

Educational development abroad under public and private sponsorship

U.S. military training with its emphasis on democratic values given to military personnel of the developing nations

Sister relationships between institutions such as states, cities, universities, etc.

The Peace Corps

Training of citizen leadership by groups such as the League of Women Voters

Another reason why our activities are not felt to be interference is that our political aims are consistent with those of the developing nations. They hold self-determination as one of their highest principles. We seek to advance and protect that right.

Self-determination is closely linked to the idea of self-government. This is America's great heritage. By exploiting and promoting this principle, we can be more potent than the Communists in influencing political development. The Communists exploit grievances as a stepping stone to a rigid, doctrinaire regime. Democratically-oriented leadership in a developing country can be just as determined to alleviate grievances.

I hope these objections can then be laid aside.

The recommendations which I shall make about political development seek to answer two questions: Who should take the responsibility for an increased effort, and what direction should these efforts take?

The urgency of gaining competence in political work is underscored by Vietnam. When the President or the Secretary of State wish to intensify our efforts in Vietnam they can turn to our military establishment which is trained and ready to serve. They can call upon our AID people, already in place and operating. But, as we are reminded so frequently, the problem is primarily political. Where do our leaders turn for operating competence in the political development field? Where in Washington is responsibility centered? Whatever competence we may be developing under fire in Vietnam, such as the work of General Lansdale, the back-up responsibility in Washington is obscure and diffuse.

A country with the stresses of Vietnam requires a highly integrated effort in which the lead is taken by those charged with the political problem. A first class political effort in such a country requires the same careful planning, training, and organizing as our military efforts.

We must give some agency this operating responsibility. The State Department should not take this assignment. Its role is to deal with existing governments and provide reports and analysis. The State Department, of course, would continue to set over-all policies within which increased political development activities would operate.

The CIA should not be that agency, despite its current activities in the political field. Its covert nature inhibits the feedback from experience which is essential to learning. It is compelled to respond to current crises. Its name abroad unfortunately

is so bad that its activities carry built-in hazards where we need to build bridges of respect and confidence.

If this responsibility is to be given to an existing agency, it should be AID which is an arm of the State Department. It should become a primary mission of AID.

Here are some suggestions for AID in assuming this major commitment. I hasten to add, these suggestions are tentatively made:

First, the agency should create a top-level political study and research staff.

Second, the agency should bring political development concepts to bear on the formulation of economic programs.

Third, it should develop an operating capability in general political development.

Fourth, it should undertake intensive preparation for accepting operational responsibility for U.S. political efforts in countries threatened with insurgency, where sensitivity to U.S. involvement is displaced by more urgent considerations.

Fifth, AID should sponsor a new institute to be termed a Center for Democratic Development to carry on those activities which the government finds difficult to do directly. This Center might have a small, full-time board which includes at least one representative from each of the two major political parties. Political party representation would contribute useful understanding of political dynamics and help insure within this country the acceptability of the Center's work.

This Center should also have a full time director and staff to research and develop operating programs for the Center. Both AID and the Center would continue to contract many activities to other groups such as universities and other non-federal public and private organizations. Satellite centers might be spawned for special purposes or activities either here or abroad.

I re-emphasize that these are tentative suggestions. If a major responsibility for political development is fixed somewhere, the possibilities will readily unfold.

What are some of these possibilities?

First, and perhaps most urgent we should provide an institutional framework to absorb and retain the knowledge, experience and personnel who are now engaged in political development efforts in the crisis areas of the world. What we learn in Vietnam must be preserved and expanded upon. At present we have no means of insuring that we build on the lessons of the past. One of the simplest lessons, for example, seems to be the value of language training. We should have many, many people in training now learning native languages and the skills which would add to our ability to be of help to a country.

I recognize that all countries must help themselves, and that there are limitations on what can be done from the outside. Too often these limitations are over-emphasized as reasons for doing nothing. The lessons of earlier years in Vietnam should teach us that at the very least we need civilians in the field who know first hand what is going on in addition to the other contributions they can make. This may be an expensive program, but the cost must be measured against the \$5 million a day which we are now expending in Vietnam.

Second, we should do more to stimulate organizations based on economic or community interest. Whether the groups are co-operatives, credit unions, campesino organizations, labor unions, or based on some other self-help concept, they give experience in democratic power. In short, these groups can become the source for popularly based political movements.

A man heading our Peace Corps in a Latin American country told me of the Corps' experience in community organization. He said that traditionally Latins use a petition

to remedy a community grievance. The only activity is a person carrying the petition around with the others looking to see who has signed. However, when the Corps stimulated community meetings, the participants experienced a political awakening. The initiative and organization demonstrated by these meetings were a revelation to the invited local officials in countries where the idea that government is the servant of the people is not widespread.

We often conceive of politics as an expression of individual persons' attitudes, but politics tend more to reflect attitudes shaped and expressed through organized groups and their leadership. The ideology of a group is tied to its experiences and to its leadership. The impact of leadership upon group ideology through inspiration, example, and commitment is enormous and needs to be fully understood and appreciated. And leadership can be influenced far more easily than is commonly believed.

Third, then, we need to encourage democratic leadership. Training opportunities for all levels of political leadership should be created, both in-country training and at U.S. or regional institutes.

Such training sometimes may be more effective without U.S. personnel participating. For example, in Latin America there are many democratic political leaders no longer in office. We should find ways through which these elder statesmen can inspire and teach promising young people.

I am acquainted with one talented American citizen who has been in political education work in Latin America. He has many useful ideas. Outside of the CIA there is no place for him to work. Every other agency disclaims responsibility for political development work. Yet there are many places around the world where his efforts are badly needed.

Fourth, we need to establish more on-going, personal links between people and groups in this country, and political and economic groups in the developing countries. We need non-governmental links with political leaders and movements built on mutual respect and understanding. These survive the stresses of fluctuating government-to-government relationships. These links serve multiple purposes. They provide a two-way communication for better understanding and exchange of ideas. They can be a vehicle for recommending politically oriented youth who would benefit from outside training. They can be a conduit for aid which strengthens political work, such as help in research and communications. (An old mimeograph machine can be essential to political communication.) They can identify problems which are creating political stresses, and articulate the views of nonruling groups. This linkage should be with as many organized groups as possible. Every organized group has political potential.

A friend of mine who has done considerable lecturing in South Asia observed in a recent report that while the USIS personnel in India were quite familiar with university professors, none knew the President of the All-India Depressed Classes Association who, he said, was a lawyer by profession and very influential among the Untouchables. He went on to point out that as a sociologist he was interested in more contact with locals, but he felt that in a subtle sense and quite unconsciously the USIS personnel tried to reduce his informal, personal contacts with locals. These tendencies would be minimized or reversed if communication at the political level were someone's primary responsibility.

In this same vein, I spoke recently with an executive director of a local party institute from a Latin American country. I asked him about his contacts with the political officers of the U.S. Embassy. He said that

Continued

their tendency was not to communicate adequately with political activists, although he had a good word to say about the number 2 political officer. He pointed out that it would not be proper for an embassy official to sit through their political meetings, but that a non-governmental person from the U.S. would be quite welcome.

The means of accomplishing this linkage will vary. A nongovernment agency is needed, but it may have to be insulated even further, perhaps through a multi-national organization. For example, we might sponsor a Center for Democratic Development for the Western Hemisphere located in Latin America and run jointly by us and Latin Americans. We may need separate non-governmental groups to establish links with different political forces in the same country. We might, for example, want an organization here in the U.S.—non-government, of course—which works with the Christian Democrats throughout Latin America. At the same time, of course, we would expect other organizations to work with other political parties.

These links need some permanence even though individuals may come and go. To maintain these links would require money for travel, conferences, bulletins and periodicals and many other activities ordinarily typical of organization efforts.

Fifth, we should encourage the development of local government consistent with the local culture. Local control over matters of local concern helps build support for the idea of government. A pluralistic development in government can add stability to a society and encourages leadership to emerge and be tested.

Sixth, we need to greatly expand existing programs of rural and urban development. Literacy, agriculture know-how, public administration—all are skills needed for effective government. I would also add those skills needed for the management of private enterprises and simple public speaking, small group leadership, and large assembly management skills.

Much of this, of course, is already being done under the umbrella of economic aid. We need to do more.

Why should we do all this? Political development work would pay enormous dividends to us as a nation.

I have just suggested several political development activities that we could engage in. Each of these rests upon assumptions about how nations grow toward political stability. If every program were undertaken as a soundly researched experiment, we would rapidly advance our basic knowledge about how things happen in the emerging world.

Perhaps Congress could be brought in on the ground floor of this educational process.

This 89th Congress elected roughly 100 new members. Suppose that our Center for Democratic Development had a program for these new members. Each would take a single developing country, study it intensively and visit it. Over a period of years, we might well get a Congress with a greatly strengthened appreciation of the problems of the developing world, of U.S. policies toward them, and of their future needs.

One of the biggest problems we face on the Hill today is winning support for the AID program. A better understanding of an AID program would be a natural by-product of Congressmen's assignments to a developing country.

These educational advances will be welcome. But may I emphasize that I am suggesting that we go forward with a massive program of political development activities based on what we now can see is needed.

We cannot afford to rely on a mystical faith that political institutions underlying stable nations will come into existence automati-

cally or by chance, everywhere in the world.

Our own country has produced able, trained people in vast numbers of civil action groups, labor unions, charitable organizations, political parties, trade associations, social groups, and local governments. With great care we can put this reservoir of political skill to use in other countries. These people can share themselves, and their ideas and skills abroad, as we have already used economic, educational, administrative, and military technicians. The dividends to us as a nation will be enormous.

Some may argue that people and ideas are not very tangible weapons in this modern world. I would counter they are the most effective weapons. I ask you to consider why the picture of Lafayette, a Frenchman, flanks the Speaker's dais in the House Chambers.

People and ideas have made this country the oldest democracy in the world. People and ideas can contribute greatly to the emergence of democratic institutions around the world.

Thank you.

JUL 13 1966

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/08/03 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600170012-1

Approved For Release 2005/08/03 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600170012-1